REMARKS

The last Office Action of September 17, 2008 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 15-17, 20-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 23 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. No amendment to the specification has been made. No fee is due.

Claims 1-7, 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,889,342 to Hasebe et al. in view of Japanese Publ. No. JP 2002-125352 to Otsuka et al.

Claims 21, 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Hasebe et al. in view of Otsuka et al., and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,300,693 to Poag et al.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Hasebe et al. in view of Otsuka et al., and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,825,110 to Page.

Claims 9, 16, 17, 20, 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Hasebe et al. in view of Otsuka et al., and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,369,386 to Lurie et al.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 23 to clearly set forth that each of the rotor pressure rings is configured for entry as well as exit of coolant, and to set forth that the coolant flow into the rotor pressure ring is realized from an area away from the shaft. In other words, coolant is able to enter and exit the electric machine on a same side and the shaft remains solid in structure.

Hasebe et al. describe a cooling circuit for a motor, whereby coolant flows through axial and radial passages in the rotor shaft before deflected by one end plate into axial passages in the core. The coolant then flows through the axial passages in the core to exit on the other side of the motor via another end plate. In other words, the Hasebe cooling circuit requires the introduction of coolant through the shaft.

The Otsuka et al. reference describes a cooling circuit for a motor, whereby outgoing coolant is deflected by a wall (28) to flow in radial direction. In contrast thereto, the coolant routing wall, recited in claims 1 and 23, is on the entry side of coolant.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that neither Hasebe et al. nor Otsuka et al., nor a combination thereof teaches or suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in independent claims 1 and 23.

As for the rejection of the retained dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 1, share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the claims on file. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Henry M. Feiereisen
Agent For Applicant
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: December 17, 2008
708 Third Avenue, Suite 1501
New York, N.Y. 10017
(212)244-5500
HMF:af